Latent Computational Complexity of Symmetry-Protected Topological Order with Fractional Symmetry

Jacob Miller* and Akimasa Miyake†
Center for Quantum Information and Control, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA

An emerging insight is that ground states of symmetry-protected topological orders (SPTO's) possess latent computational complexity in terms of their many-body entanglement. By introducing a fractional symmetry of SPTO, which requires the invariance under 3-colorable symmetries of a lattice, we prove that every renormalization fixed-point state of 2D $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ SPTO with fractional symmetry can be utilized for universal quantum computation using only Pauli measurements, as long as it belongs to a nontrivial 2D SPTO phase. Our infinite family of fixed-point states may serve as a base model to demonstrate the idea of a "quantum computational phase" of matter, whose states share universal computational complexity ubiquitously.

arXiv:1612.08135v1 [quant-ph] 24 Dec 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding the varied correspondence between quantum entanglement and quantum computation is one of the leading goals of quantum information science. Measurement-based quantum computation (MQC) [1–3], where computation is driven by single-spin measurements on a many-body resource state, lets us study this correspondence directly, in terms of the computations achievable with a fixed resource state. Of particular interest are the universal resource states, whose many-body entanglement lets us implement any quantum computation efficiently [4–6]. In trying to characterize the entanglement found in universal resource states, researchers have developed a long list of examples, from the 2D cluster state [7, 8] and certain tensor network states [4, 5, 9–13], to condensed matter models such as 2D Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki (AKLT) states [14–18] and renormalization fixed-point states of interacting bosonic quantum matter [19, 20].

An emergent insight from these examples has been the utility of symmetry-protected topological order (SPTO), a form of quantum order arising from nontrivial many-body entanglement protected by a symmetry [21–29]. This insight has led researchers to investigate the possibility of a general correspondence between SPTO and MQC, with the ultimate aim of discovering a "universal computational phase" of quantum matter. In such a phase, the constituent states' SPTO and symmetry alone are sufficient to organize them as universal resource states. While this approach has uncovered increasingly general examples of single-qubit computational phases in 1D spin chains [30–40], much less is known in the computationally important setting of 2D spin systems outside of variously perturbed phases containing the cluster state [41–45]. This disparity comes not only from the increased complexity present in 2D many-body systems, but also from the existence of physically distinct forms of 2D SPTO with different operational capabilities [19]. For these reasons, we have yet to develop even a base model for realizing the idea of a universal computational phase within the framework of SPTO.

Here, we demonstrate the existence of a universal computational phase within the simplified setting of "3-cocycle states" – 2D model states describing renormalization fixed-point SPTO [23] – with global symmetry group $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$. We first characterize those states which satisfy an additional fractional symmetry condition, where symmetry operators are applied to only a certain fraction of spins on a 3-colorable lattice. We show that 3-cocycle states with fractional symmetry admit an elementary description in terms of an algebraic component tensor, which constitutes a powerful tool for analyzing such states. Using this description, we classify the families of fractionally-symmetric states under local unitary equivalence, and show that every such state is equal to a collection of multiple irreducible states. The Union Jack state of [19] is seen to be the simplest nontrivial irreducible state, and its known universality for MQC lets us prove that every nontrivial $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ 3-cocycle state with fractional symmetry on a Union Jack lattice is a universal resource state. Our findings, which include similar results in the setting of fractionally symmetric 1D spin chains, constitute compelling evidence for the existence of a universal computational phase among general fractionally symmetric SPTO states.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Measurement-based Quantum Computation

Measurement-based quantum computation (MQC) is a means of using an entangled many-body resource state to perform quantum computation via measurements which are local to single lattice sites. An MQC protocol is adaptive if the choice of measurement basis depends on previous measurement outcomes. A universal resource state is one which allows any unitary quantum circuit to be efficiently implemented using single-site measurements.

* jmilla@unm.edu
† amiyake@unm.edu



FIG. 1. The 1D cluster state $|\psi_{1C}\rangle$ (a), and 2D Union Jack state $|\psi_{UJ}\rangle$ (b), canonical examples of the entangled many-body states we investigate here. (a) The 1D cluster state is obtained by placing qubit $|+\rangle$ states (with $|+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$) in a 1D spin chain, then entangling all nearest-neighbors with the two-qubit unitary CZ, acting as $CZ\,|\alpha,\beta\rangle = (-1)^{\alpha\cdot\beta}\,|\alpha,\beta\rangle$. (b) The Union Jack state is obtained by placing $|+\rangle$ states on the vertices of a 2D Union Jack lattice, then entangling all nearest-neighbor triples with the three-qubit unitary CCZ, acting as $CCZ\,|\alpha,\beta,\gamma\rangle = (-1)^{\alpha\cdot\beta\cdot\gamma}\,|\alpha,\beta,\gamma\rangle$. Both $|\psi_{1C}\rangle$ and $|\psi_{UJ}\rangle$ possess a distinctive "fractional symmetry", leaving them invariant when X is applied only to qubits on sites of a single color (A, B, or C). By replacing the $(d-1)$-controlled Z gates by unitaries $U(\omega_d)$ which are parameterized by d-cocycles of a group G, we obtain the cocycle state model of [23].

While MQC has historically focused on the 2D cluster state [7], which has a peculiar nature regarding SPTO (c.f. Theorem 1 of [19]), we will be more interested here in its 1D spin chain cousin, as well as the Union Jack state of [19] (see Figure 1). Within MQC, the 1D cluster state has the limited capability to implement all single-qubit operations, while the Union Jack state has the special property of being universal using only Pauli measurements, called Pauli universality.

B. Symmetry-Protected Topological Order

Symmetry-protected topological order (SPTO) is a quantum phenomenon arising in many-body systems with global symmetry G, which we will always assume to be abelian. An SPTO phase is the collection of all many-body states connected to some fiducial short-range entangled state by the action of a constant depth quantum circuit built from constant range, symmetry-respecting gates. The trivial SPTO phase is the unique phase containing unentangled product states. In this sense, non-trivial SPTO represents a form of persistent many-body entanglement, protected by a symmetry group G.

SPTO phases can be mathematically classified using group cohomology theory [23]. For 2D states, SPTO phases relative to G correspond to elements of the third cohomology group of G, $\mathcal{H}^3(G,U(1))$. We can analyze $\mathcal{H}^3(G,U(1))$ using 3-cocycles, complex-valued functions $\omega_3(g_1,g_2,g_3) : G^3 \to U(1)$ which satisfy the condition $\partial_3\omega_3(g_0,g_1,g_2,g_3) := \omega_3(g_1,g_2,g_3)\,\omega_3^*(g_0g_1,g_2,g_3)\,\omega_3(g_0,g_1g_2,g_3)\,\omega_3^*(g_0,g_1,g_2g_3)\,\omega_3(g_0,g_1,g_2) = 1$, for all $g_0,g_1,g_2,g_3 \in G$. Each 3-cocycle ω_3 belongs to a unique "cohomology class", $[\omega_3]_G \in \mathcal{H}^3(G,U(1))$, with the cohomology class of the trivial function $\omega_3(g_1,g_2,g_3) = 1$ being the trivial SPTO phase. This extends to states in any $d \geq 0$ spatial dimensions, where SPTO phases can be classified using $\mathcal{H}^{d+1}(G,U(1))$. A more extensive introduction to group cohomology is given in Appendix A.

C. Cocycle States

While the above correspondence between SPTO phases and cohomology classes may appear obscure, it lets us construct useful SPTO fixed-point states within the cocycle state model of [23]. This model concretely realizes an abstract d-cocycle ω_d as a d-body unitary gate $U(\omega_d)$, which is then used to form a $d-1$ dimensional many-body state $|\psi(\omega_d)\rangle$. This state is invariant under the global symmetry group G associated to ω_d, and belongs to the SPTO phase associated with $[\omega_d]_G$. As above, we will focus here on the 2D case ($d = 3$), but can extend this to any $d \geq 0$ spatial dimensions.

For a given symmetry group G, $|\psi(\omega_3)\rangle$ is formed from $|G|$-dimensional qudits arranged on a 2D lattice with closed boundaries. Our on-site symmetry operators X_g act in a generalized computational basis as $X_g|h\rangle = |gh\rangle$, for every $g,h \in G$. When $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$, choosing a generating set for G (explained below) lets us decompose our qudit Hilbert space into m "virtual" qubits, on which $X_g = \bigotimes_{i=1}^m (X_i)^{g_i}$. We visualize these qubits as being stacked in vertical layers, from $i = 1$ (top) to $i = m$ (bottom). The state $|+_G\rangle = |+\rangle^{\otimes m}$ is the unique state which is invariant under all X_g.

ω_3 sets the eigenvalues of our 3-body unitary $U(\omega_3)$, as $U(\omega_3) = \sum_{g,h,f\in G} \omega_3(g,g^{-1}h,h^{-1}f)\,|g,h,f\rangle\langle g,h,f|$. We form $|\psi(\omega_3)\rangle$ by placing $|+_G\rangle$ states at every vertex of a 3-colorable lattice, then applying $U(\omega_3)$ (or $U(\omega_3)^\dagger$) to all nearest-neighbor triples of qudits Δ_3. The three arguments g,h,f are paired with the three qudits in each Δ_3 according to their lattice colors. In this case, $|\psi(\omega_3)\rangle = \left(\prod_{\Delta_3\in\Lambda} U(\omega)^{\pm 1}_{\Delta_3}\right)|+_G\rangle^{\otimes n}$, where the alternation of $U(\omega_3)$ and its complex conjugate is described in [23].

The 1D cluster state and Union Jack state are both examples of $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ cocycle states, with respective cocycles $\omega_2^{(1C)}(g,h) = (-1)^{g\cdot h}$ and $\omega_3^{(UJ)}(g,h,f) = (-1)^{g\cdot h\cdot f}$ (c.f. Appendix B of [19]). However, the 1D cluster and Union Jack states each possess additional "$\frac{1}{d}$" fractional symmetry, leaving them invariant under the application of X_g to all spins on a fixed vertex color of a d-colorable lattice. As we show in Section III, this symmetry arises from each cocycle being a d-linear function, which we define explicitly for $d = 3$.

A function $\tau_3(g,h,f) : G^3 \to U(1)$ is 3-linear (trilinear) when it satisfies $\tau_3(gg',h,f) = \tau_3(g,h,f)\tau_3(g',h,f)$, and similar conditions for its second and third arguments. Every trilinear function is a 3-cocycle, but one which possesses additional algebraic structure. This lets

us efficiently describe the action of τ_3 by choosing a generating set for $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$, defined to be a collection of m elements $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^m \subseteq G$ relative to which any $g \in G$ is $g = \prod_{i=1}^m (e_i)^{g_i}$ for a unique choice of binary coordinates g_i. Given a fixed generating set, we can express $\tau_3(g,h,f) = (-1)^{\sum_{i,j,k=1}^m \hat{\tau}_3(i,j,k)\cdot g_i \cdot h_j \cdot f_k}$, where i,j,k index the generators of $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$, and $\hat{\tau}_3(i,j,k)$ is a binary "component" of τ_3 which encodes the value of $\tau_3(e_i,e_j,e_k)$. These components form an $m \times m \times m$ binary tensor $\hat{\tau}_3$, whose transformation under index-dependent changes of generating set will be of interest to us below. We can similarly define 2-linear (bilinear) functions $\tau_2(g,h)$, which admit efficient descriptions in terms of $m \times m$ binary component matrices $\hat{\tau}_2(i,j)$.

III. CHARACTERIZING COCYCLE STATES WITH FRACTIONAL SYMMETRY

Considering the presence of fractional symmetry in the 1D cluster state and Union Jack state, it is natural to ask how this symmetry orders the entanglement of general many-body states. Our main results constitute a largely exhaustive answer to this question for 1D 2-cocycle states and 2D 3-cocycle states. We first show that any $\frac{1}{d}$-symmetric cocycle state with $d = 2$ or $d = 3$ and $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ is either a trivial product state, or is reducible by local operations to one or more disjoint copies of the 1D cluster state or the Union Jack state, respectively. For $d = 2$, this characterization is complete, in the sense that every nontrivial $\frac{1}{2}$-symmetric cocycle state $|\psi(\omega_2)\rangle$ is isomorphic to r copies of $|\psi_{1C}\rangle$, for some ω_2-dependent $r \geq 1$. When $d = 3$ however, we show that general $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle states with $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ are isomorphic to r disjoint "irreducible" 3-cocycle states, of which the Union Jack state is the simplest. An operational procedure lets us finally prove that all nontrivial 3-cocycle states with $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetry and $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ are Pauli universal MQC resource states, identifying a surprisingly robust correspondence between fractional symmetry and the utility of algebraic resource states for quantum computation.

As a first step, we characterize the algebraic properties of cocycle states with $\frac{1}{d}$-symmetry. We show that for $d = 2,3$, d-cocycle state with $\frac{1}{d}$-symmetry are precisely those generated by d-linear functions, as stated in Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *Let $|\psi(\omega_d)\rangle$ be a d-cocycle state defined on a d-colorable lattice with closed boundaries, generated by a d-cocycle ω_d with $d = 2,3$. $|\psi(\omega_d)\rangle$ is $\frac{1}{d}$-symmetric, i.e. is invariant under the application of G to all sites of any one of the d lattice colors, if and only if it is generated by a unique d-linear function τ_d, so that $|\psi(\omega_d)\rangle = |\psi(\tau_d)\rangle$.*

Lemma 1 admits a natural generalization to arbitrary d, but due to our focus on low-dimensional MQC resource states, we leave this general version as a conjecture. Proving that d-linear cocycle states possess $\frac{1}{d}$-symmetry is trivial, so we focus on the reverse implication. Our proof involves studying the action of fractional symmetry operators on local regions of a d-cocycle state $|\psi(\omega_d)\rangle$, and iteratively building up necessary conditions for $|\psi(\omega_d)\rangle$ to possess $\frac{1}{d}$-symmetry. We eventually find that ω_d can be written as the product of a unique d-linear τ_d with additional terms which only act on the boundaries of our system, proving our result. The detailed proof of Lemma 1 can be found in Appendix B.

The specification of d-linear τ_d's in terms of a d-index component tensor $\hat{\tau}_d$ lets us decompose $U(\tau_d)$ as a product of d-qubit component unitary gates, one for each nonzero component of $\hat{\tau}_d$. When $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ and $d = 2$ or 3, these component gates are CZ or CCZ, respectively, which shows the states $|\psi(\tau_d)\rangle$ to be examples of so-called hypergraph states [46–48]. This decomposition of $U(\tau_d)$ into CZ or CCZ gates relies on a choice of generating set for each vertex color in our d-colorable lattice, on which color-dependent changes of generating set will act as gauge freedoms in our description of $|\psi(\tau_d)\rangle$. We can fix these spurious degrees of freedom by determining the local unitary orbits of $|\psi(\tau_d)\rangle$ under color-dependent changes of basis, which in practice is equivalent to finding a normal form for our component tensor $\hat{\tau}_d$.

For 1D and 2D states, this classification takes a particularly simple form in terms of irreducible $\frac{1}{d}$-symmetric cocycle states $|\psi(\gamma_i)\rangle$ (defined below), as given in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. *Let $|\psi(\tau_d)\rangle$ be a nontrivial $\frac{1}{d}$-symmetric d-cocycle state on closed boundaries, with global symmetry group $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ and $d = 2,3$. By an appropriate color-dependent change of basis, there is a unique r with $1 \leq r \leq m$ such that the nontrivial portion of $|\psi(\tau_d)\rangle$ is isomorphic to r disjoint irreducible $\frac{1}{d}$-symmetric cocycle states, i.e. $\bigotimes_{i=1}^r |\psi(\gamma_i)\rangle$.*

We use $\zeta_d(m)$ to denote the number of distinct irreducible d-cocycle states in $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$, which can be determined using the component tensors $\hat{\tau}_d$. When $d = 2$, we reduce $\hat{\tau}_2$ to normal form using color-dependent changes of generating set on lattice colors A, B, which transform $\hat{\tau}_2$ to $\chi_A^T \hat{\tau}_2 \chi_B$ with invertible binary matrices χ_A, χ_B. By choosing χ_A and χ_B to implement elementary row and column operations, we can transform $\hat{\tau}_2$ into a simple diagonal normal form using Gaussian elimination. This gives $U(\tau_2)$ as a product of disjoint CZ gates forming r disjoint copies of $|\psi_{1C}\rangle$, where r is the rank of $\hat{\tau}_2$ (see Figure 2a). This completes our proof of Theorem 1 for $d = 2$, and in the process shows also that $\zeta_2(m) = 1$ for all m. In other words, the unique 1D irreducible cocycle state is the 1D cluster state.

When $d = 3$, our formation unitaries $U(\tau_3)$ correspond to 3-index component tensors $\hat{\tau}_3$, which are more difficult to characterize. In analogy to our proof for $d = 2$, we use color-dependent changes of basis to rewrite $\hat{\tau}_3$ as a collection of r irreducible tensors, which form the r irreducible $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle states in Theorem 1. More precisely, we say that a tensor $\hat{\tau}_3$ is irreducible when it cannot be written as the sum of two nonzero tensors with



FIG. 2. (a) By fixing a generating set for $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ at sites A and B, we can represent the entangling gates $U(\tau_2)$ which form our $\frac{1}{2}$-symmetric 2-cocycle state in terms of an $m \times m$ binary component matrix, $\hat{\tau}_2$. Each nonzero entry of $\hat{\tau}_2$ gives a CZ gate between virtual qubits on different sites. Through color-dependent changes of generating set for $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ (corresponding to color-dependent changes of basis for the single-spin Hilbert spaces), we can use Gaussian elimination to reduce $\hat{\tau}_2$ into a diagonal normal form, in which our state is simply $r = \text{rank}(\hat{\tau}_2)$ disjoint 1D cluster states. Here, $m = 3$ and $r = 2$. (b) In 2D, we again use color-dependent changes of generating set to simplify our state, but now represent the 3-body entangling gates $U(\tau_3)$ in terms of a 3-index binary component tensor, $\hat{\tau}_3$ (not shown). Each nonzero entry of $\hat{\tau}_3$ gives a CCZ gate between triples of virtual qubits. Our normal form in this setting reduces our state to r disjoint irreducible 3-cocycle states, where here again $m = 3$ and $r = 2$. (c) Representatives of the $\zeta_3(2) = 4$ irreducible 3-cocycle states which can exist in $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^2$. Theorem 1 says that any $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric 3-cocycle state with $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ is either trivial, isomorphic to one of these states (up to permutation of lattice colors), or isomorphic to two disjoint copies of the Union Jack state (the only irreducible state in $\mathbb{Z}_2$). An exhaustive numerical search shows also that of the $2^{m^3} = 2^{27}$ possible $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle states in $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^3$, there exist only $\zeta_3(3) = 50$ distinct irreducible states up to local changes of basis. However, a precise classification of irreducible cocycle states is unnecessary for our purposes, since every irreducible state is at least as operationally useful as the Union Jack state (Corollary 1).

disjoint supports at every index. Unlike the $d = 2$ case, in $d = 3$ there is no known analog of Gaussian elimination for efficiently converting $\hat{\tau}_3$ into this normal form. Despite this difficulty, we show in Appendix C 3 that we still arrive at a normal form which allows us to prove Theorem 1 for $d = 3$. In other words, the behavior of general $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle states can be determined entirely through a classification of the irreducible cocycle states.

In the simplest case of $m = 1$, the only nontrivial trilinear function is $\omega_3^{(UJ)}$ (defined in Section II C), which shows that $\zeta_3(1) = 1$. In contrast to the 1D setting though, in 2D we find a wealth of distinct irreducible cocycle states, the simplest of which are shown in Figure 2c. A numerical search shows that $\zeta_3(2) = 4$ and $\zeta_3(3) = 50$, and we expect there to be an infinite number of irreducible states for general $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$. Despite this difficulty, it is nonetheless clear that every irreducible $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle state should contain at least as much usable entanglement as the simple Union Jack state. This intuition allows us to prove a useful operational corollary to Theorem 1 for $d = 3$.

Corollary 1. *Let $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ be a nontrivial $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric 3-cocycle state with global symmetry group $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ defined on a Union Jack lattice. By appropriate color-dependent changes of basis and non-adaptive single-qubit Z measurements, $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ can be reduced to r disjoint copies of the Union Jack state, for the same state-dependent $r \geq 1$ as in Theorem 1. Consequently, $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ is a Pauli universal resource state for MQC.*

We prove Corollary 1 by showing that any irreducible $|\psi(\gamma_i)\rangle$ can be transformed by some color-dependent change of generating set into a single copy of the Union Jack state, which is disjoint or "vertex entangled" with other virtual qubits. This guarantees that measuring Z on all other virtual qubits will leave behind only the Union Jack state, up to unimportant Pauli byproduct operators. Applying this protocol to each irreducible $|\psi(\gamma_i)\rangle$ in Theorem 1 suffices to prove Corollary 1. Further details can be found in Appendix C 2.

Having discussed the general classification and computational power of low-dimensional $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle states $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$, we now move on to study their SPTO phases relative to the fractional symmetry group $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$. This classification relative to $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$ is sufficient to determine the SPTO phase of $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ relative to any subgroup of $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$, including the usual global symmetry G. While $G_{\frac{1}{3}} \simeq G^3$ as groups, they differ operationally in the former arranging each copy of G on a distinct vertex color ("horizontally"), and the latter arranging each copy on a distinct layer of a single vertex ("vertically"). This leads to a simple characterization of the SPTO present in these states, as given in Theorem 2.

Theorem 2. *Let $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle, |\psi(\tau_3')\rangle$ be two $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric 3-cocycle states with global symmetry group G, where τ_3 and τ_3' are trilinear functions. If $\tau_3 \neq \tau_3'$, then $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ and $|\psi(\tau_3')\rangle$ belong to different SPTO phases relative to $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$. In particular, if τ_3 is nontrivial, then $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ possesses nontrivial SPTO relative to $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$.*

We prove Theorem 2 by embedding each 3-cocycle state $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ into a larger Hilbert space associated with G^3, where the original $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$ fractional symmetry of $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ is simulated using an operationally equivalent G^3 global symmetry. This lets us use a known classification of 2D SPTO phases relative to global G^3 symmetry to show that each component of $\hat{\tau}_3$ is actually a unique label of the SPTO phase of $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$, relative to $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$. As a result, two states $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle, |\psi(\tau_3')\rangle$ are in the same SPTO phase only when their associated tensors $\hat{\tau}_3, \hat{\tau}_3'$ are identical, which proves Theorem 2. Further details of our proof can be found in Appendix C 3.

IV. OUTLOOK

We have shown that computationally universal entanglement is a ubiquitous property of fixed-point states of SPTO with fractional symmetry. While we were able to obtain "exact" universal resource states in our simplified setting of fixed-point model states, more general states in each SPTO phase may require renormalization-style techniques like those of [34, 37, 39, 40] to extract their usefulness for MQC. Overall, we expect fractional symmetry to be a powerful tool for guaranteeing certain operational capabilities in more general quantum information processing tasks, such as quantum simulation [49, 50] and fault-tolerant quantum computation [51–53].

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported in part by National Science Foundation grants PHY-1314955, PHY-1521016, and PHY-1620651.

[1] R. Raussendorf and H.J. Briegel, *A One-Way Quantum Computer*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).

[2] R. Raussendorf, D.E. Browne, and H.J. Briegel, *Measurement-Based Quantum Computation on Cluster States*, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022312 (2003).

[3] R. Jozsa, *An Introduction to Measurement Based Quantum Computation*, arXiv:quant-ph/0508124, (2005).

[4] M. Van den Nest, A. Miyake, W. Dür, and H.J. Briegel, *Universal Resources for Measurement-Based Quantum Computation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 150504 (2006).

[5] M. Van den Nest, W. Dür, A. Miyake and H.J. Briegel, *Fundamentals of universality in one-way quantum computation*, New J. Phys. **9**, (2007).

[6] X. Chen, R. Duan, Z. Ji, and B. Zeng, *Quantum State Reduction for Universal Measurement Based Computation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 020502 (2010).

[7] H.J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, *Persistent Entanglement in Arrays of Interacting Particles*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 910 (2001).

[8] D.-L. Zhou, B. Zeng, Z. Xu, and C.-P. Sun, *Quantum computation based on d-level cluster state*, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062303 (2003).

[9] F. Verstraete and J.I. Cirac, *Valence-Bond States for Quantum Computation*, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 060302(R) (2004).

[10] D. Gross and J. Eisert, *Novel Schemes for Measurement-Based Quantum Computation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 220503 (2007).

[11] D. Gross, J. Eisert, N. Schuch, and D. Pérez-García, *Measurement-Based Quantum Computation Beyond The One-way Model*, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052315 (2007).

[12] X. Chen, B. Zeng, Z.-C. Gu, B. Yoshida, and I.L. Chuang, *Gapped Two-Body Hamiltonian Whose Unique Ground State Is Universal for One-Way Quantum Computation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** 220501 (2009).

[13] J.-M. Cai, A. Miyake, W. Dür, and H.J. Briegel, *Universal Quantum Computer from a Quantum Magnet*, Phys. Rev. A, **82**, 052309 (2010).

[14] A. Miyake, *Quantum Computational Capability of a 2D Valence Bond Solid Phase*, Ann. Phys. **326**, 1656 (2011).

[15] T.-C. Wei, I. Affleck, and R. Raussendorf, *Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki State on a Honeycomb Lattice is a Universal Quantum Computational Resource*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 070501 (2011).

[16] A.S. Darmawan, G.K. Brennen, and S.D. Bartlett, *Measurement-Based Quantum Computation in a 2D Phase of Matter*, New J. Phys. **14**, 013023 (2012).

[17] T.-C. Wei, *Quantum Computational Universality of Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki States Beyond the Honeycomb Lattice*, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 062307 (2013).

[18] T.-C. Wei and R. Raussendorf, *Universal Measurement-based Quantum Computation with Spin-2 Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki States*, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 012310 (2015).

[19] J. Miller and A. Miyake, *Hierarchy of Universal Entanglement in 2D Measurement-based Quantum Computation*, npj Quantum Information **2**, 16036 (2016).

[20] H.P. Nautrup and T.-C. Wei, *Symmetry-protected topologically ordered states for universal quantum computation*, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 052309 (2015).

[21] Z.-C. Gu and X.-G. Wen, *Tensor-Entanglement-Filtering Renormalization Approach and Symmetry-*

Protected Topological Order, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 155131 (2009).

[22] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, *Symmetry Protected Topological Orders in Interacting Bosonic Systems*, Science **338**, 1604 (2012).

[23] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, *Symmetry Protected Topological Orders and the Group Cohomology of Their Symmetry Group*, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 155114 (2013).

[24] A. Kitaev, *Periodic Table for Topological Insulators and Superconductors*, AIP Conf. Proc. **1134**, 22 (2009).

[25] S. Ryu, A.P. Schnyder, A. Furusaki and A.W. Ludwig, *Topological Insulators and Superconductors: Ten-Fold Way and Dimensional Hierarchy*, New J. Phys. **12**, 065010 (2010).

[26] F. Pollmann, E. Berg, A.M. Turner, and M. Oshikawa, *Symmetry Protection of Topological Phases in One-Dimensional Quantum Spin Systems*, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 075125 (2012).

[27] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, *Classification of Gapped Symmetric Phases in One-Dimensional Spin Systems*, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 035107 (2011).

[28] N. Schuch, D. Pérez-García, and J.I. Cirac, *Classifying Quantum Phases Using Matrix Product States and Projected Entangled Pair States*, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 165139 (2011).

[29] F. Pollmann, A.M. Turner, E. Berg, and M. Oshikawa, *Entanglement Spectrum of a Topological Phase in One Dimension*, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 064439 (2010).

[30] G. K. Brennen and A. Miyake, *Measurement-Based Quantum Computer in the Gapped Ground State of a Two-Body Hamiltonian*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 010502 (2008).

[31] A.C. Doherty and S.D. Bartlett, *Identifying phases of quantum many-body systems that are universal for quantum computation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 020506 (2009).

[32] S.O. Skrøvseth and S.D. Bartlett, *Phase transitions and localizable entanglement in cluster-state spin chains with Ising couplings and local fields*, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022316 (2009).

[33] A. Miyake, *Quantum Computation on the Edge of a Symmetry-Protected Topological Order*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 040501 (2010).

[34] S.D. Bartlett, G.K. Brennen, A. Miyake, and J.M. Renes, *Quantum Computational Renormalization in the Haldane Phase*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 110502 (2010).

[35] D.V. Else, I. Schwarz, S.D. Bartlett, and A.C. Doherty, *Symmetry-Protected Phases for Measurement-Based Quantum Computation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 240505 (2012).

[36] D.V. Else, S.D. Bartlett, and A.C. Doherty, *Symmetry Protection of Measurement-Based Quantum Computation in Ground States*, New J. Phys. **14**, 113016 (2012).

[37] J. Miller and A. Miyake, *Resource Quality of a Symmetry-Protected Topologically Ordered Phase for Quantum Computation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 120506 (2015).

[38] A. Prakash and T.-C. Wei, *Ground States of One-Dimensional Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases and Their Utility as Resource States for Quantum Computation*, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022310 (2015).

[39] R. Raussendorf, D.-S. Wang, A. Prakash, T-C. Wei, and D.T. Stephen, *Symmetry-protected topological phases with uniform computational power in one dimension*, arXiv:1609.07549, (2016).

[40] D.T. Stephen, D.-S. Wang, A. Prakash, T-C. Wei, and R. Raussendorf, *Determining the computational power of symmetry protected topological phases*, arXiv:1611.08053, (2016).

[41] W. Son, L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Hamma, S. Pascazio, and V. Vedral, *Quantum phase transition between cluster and antiferromagnetic states*, Europhys. Lett. **95**, 50001 (2011).

[42] H. Kalis, D. Klagges, R. Orús, and K.P. Schmidt, *Fate of the cluster state on the square lattice in a magnetic field*, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 022317 (2012).

[43] R. Orús, H. Kalis, M. Bornemann, and K.P. Schmidt, *Bounds on universal quantum computation with perturbed two-dimensional cluster states*, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 062312 (2013).

[44] K. Fujii, Y. Nakata, M. Ohzeki, and M. Murao, *Measurement-Based Quantum Computation on Symmetry Breaking Thermal States*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 120502 (2013).

[45] T.-C. Wei, Y. Li, and L.C. Kwek, *Transitions in the quantum computational power*, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 052315 (2014).

[46] M. Rossi, M. Huber, D. Bruß, and C. Macchiavello, *Quantum Hypergraph States*, New J. Phys. **15**, 113022 (2013).

[47] O. Gühne, M. Cuquet, F.E.S. Steinhoff, T. Moroder, M. Rossi, D. Bruß, B. Kraus, and C. Macchiavello, *Entanglement and Nonclassical Properties of Hypergraph States*, J. Phys. A **47**, 335303 (2014).

[48] F.E.S. Steinhoff, C. Ritz, N. Miklin, and O. Gühne, *Qudit Hypergraph States*, arXiv:1612.06418, (2016).

[49] J.I. Cirac and P. Zoller, *Goals and opportunities in quantum simulation*, Nat. Phys. **8**, 264266 (2012).

[50] I.M. Georgescu, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, *Quantum simulation*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 153185 (2014).

[51] B. Yoshida, *Topological Color Code and Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases*, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 245131 (2015).

[52] B. Yoshida, *Gapped Boundaries, Group Cohomology and Fault-Tolerant Logical Gates*, arXiv:1509.03626, (2015).

[53] S. Roberts, B. Yoshida, A. Kubica, S.D. Bartlett, *Symmetry protected topological order at nonzero temperature*, arXiv:1611.05450, (2016).

[54] M. de Wild Propitius, *Topological interactions in broken gauge theories*, PhD Thesis, arXiv:hep-th/9511195, (1995).

[55] M.P. Zaletel, *Detecting two-dimensional symmetry-protected topological order in a ground-state wave function*, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 235113 (2014).

Appendix A: Group Cohomology and Cocycle States

In this section, we present a more complete discussion of group cohomology theory and the cocycle state model of [23], which sets the stage for our proof of Lemma 1 in Appendix B.

1. Group Cohomology

Group cohomology theory studies the cohomology groups $\mathcal{H}^d(G,U(1))$ associated to a group G, for arbitrary $d \geq 0$. For our purposes, the elements of $\mathcal{H}^d(G,U(1))$ can be thought of as classifying the SPTO phases of short-range entangled many-body states with global symmetry G in $d-1$ spatial dimensions. The structure of the cohomology groups can be calculated using (inhomogeneous) d-cochains, which are arbitrary functions ξ_d mapping d-tuples of elements of G, $(g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_d) \in G^d$, to individual complex phases $\xi_d(g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_d) \in U(1)$. The set of all d-cochains is denoted by $\mathcal{C}^d(G,U(1))$, and under pointwise multiplication of function values forms an abelian group isomorphic to $U(1)^{|G|^d}$. The identity element of $\mathcal{C}^d(G,U(1))$ is the trivial d-cochain 1_d, which outputs the constant value 1. The (d'th) coboundary operator $\partial_d : \mathcal{C}^d(G,U(1)) \to \mathcal{C}^{d+1}(G,U(1))$ sends every d-cochain ξ_d to a $(d+1)$-cochain $\partial_d\xi_d$, which acts as

$$\partial_d\xi_d(g_1,\ldots,g_{d+1}) = \xi_d(g_2,\ldots,g_{d+1}) \left\{ \prod_{k=1}^{d} [\xi_d(g_1,\ldots,g_{k-1},g_kg_{k+1},g_{k+2},\ldots,g_{d+1})]^{(-1)^k} \right\} [\xi_n(g_1,\ldots,g_d)]^{(-1)^{d+1}}. \tag{A1}$$

For example, when $d=2$, $\partial_2\xi_2(g_1,g_2,g_3) = \xi_2(g_2,g_3)\,\xi_2^*(g_1g_2,g_3)\,\xi_2(g_1,g_2g_3)\,\xi_2^*(g_1,g_2)$. The coboundary operator lets us define two important classes of cochains, the cocycles and coboundaries. A d-cocycle ω_d is a d-cochain which lies in the kernel of ∂_d, satisfying $\partial_d\omega_d = 1_{d+1}$, while a d-coboundary φ_d is a d-cochain which lies in the image of ∂_{d-1}, satisfying $\varphi_d = \partial_{d-1}\xi_{d-1}$ for some $(d-1)$-cochain ξ_{d-1}. The collection of d-cochains and d-coboundaries are denoted by $\mathcal{Z}^d(G,U(1))$ and $\mathcal{B}^d(G,U(1))$ respectively, both of which form subgroups of $\mathcal{C}^d(G,U(1))$.

Eq. (A1) can be used to show that $\partial_{d+1}\partial_d\xi_d = 1_{d+2}$ for every d-cochain ξ_d, which proves the inclusion $\mathcal{B}^d(G,U(1)) \subset \mathcal{Z}^d(G,U(1))$. The d'th cohomology group characterizes the extent to which the reverse inclusion fails to hold, via $\mathcal{H}^d(G,U(1)) = \mathcal{Z}^d(G,U(1))/\mathcal{B}^d(G,U(1))$. The elements of $\mathcal{H}^d(G,U(1))$, the cohomology classes, are represented as equivalence classes of d-cocycles modulo d-coboundaries, $[\omega_d]_G \in \mathcal{H}^d(G,U(1))$, where $[\omega_d']_G = [\omega_d]_G$ if and only if $\omega_d'\,\omega_d^{-1} = \varphi_d \in \mathcal{B}^d(G,U(1))$.

While the above is in principle a complete discussion of the most basic definitions and concepts of group cohomology theory, it is important to recognize that this formalism can also be presented entirely in terms of "homogeneous" cochains, which are simply reparameterized versions of the inhomogeneous cochains described above. Given an inhomogeneous d-cochain $\xi_d(g_1\ldots,g_d)$, we can uniquely define a homogeneous d-cochain $\lambda_d(a_0,\ldots,a_d)$, which is related to ξ_d as

$$\lambda_d(a_0,\ldots,a_d) = \xi_d(a_0^{-1}a_1, a_1^{-1}a_2, \ldots, a_{d-1}^{-1}a_d) \tag{A2}$$

$$\xi_d(g_1\ldots,g_d) = \lambda_d(e, g_1, g_1g_2, \ldots, g_1g_2g_3\ldots g_d). \tag{A3}$$

While homogeneous d-cochains are naively functions of $d+1$ arguments, rather than the d arguments appearing in ξ_d, this is compensated for by the symmetry $\lambda_d(a_0,\ldots,a_d) = \lambda_d(e, a_0^{-1}a_1, a_0^{-1}a_2, \ldots, a_0^{-1}a_d)$, which holds for all $a_0 \in G$. In the setting of homogeneous cochains, the (d'th) coboundary operator acts as

$$\partial_d\lambda_d(a_0,a_1,\ldots,a_{d+1}) = \prod_{k=0}^{d+1} [\lambda_d(a_1,\ldots,a_{k-1},a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{d+1})]^{(-1)^k}. \tag{A4}$$

For example, when $d=2$, $\partial_2\lambda_2(a_0,a_1,a_2,a_3) = \lambda_2(a_1,a_2,a_3)\,\lambda_2^*(a_0,a_2,a_3)\,\lambda_2(a_0,a_1,a_3)\,\lambda_2^*(a_0,a_1,a_2)$. Homogeneous d-cocycles (resp., d-coboundaries) are defined exactly the same as in the inhomogeneous setting, as d-cochains lying in the kernel of ∂_d (resp., the image of ∂_{d-1}). In what follows, we will denote general homogeneous d-cocycles by ν_d.

While we would ideally avoid discussing both forms of d-cocycles within the same setting, each form turns out to play a significant role in our work. Inhomogeneous d-cocycles serve to capture the algebraic character of group cohomology, and have a close relation to d-linear functions, whereas homogeneous d-cocycles serve to capture the physical behavior of systems appearing in the d-cocycle model. This dual nature is most apparent in Appendix B, during our proof of Lemma 1, where we start with a homogeneous ν_d defining a d-cocycle state, and end with a proof that the *inhomogeneous* counterpart of ν_d is a d-linear function. This issue is touched upon in more detail in Appendices A 2 and B.

2. Cocycle States

In this Section, we discuss several important details of the d-cocycle state construction [23], which we describe here in the more context-appropriate formalism of homogeneous d-cocycles. We also introduce the idea of "d-cochain states", a relatively uninteresting generalization of d-cocycle states which will be utilized in our proof of Lemma 1.

At a broad level, the d-cocycle state construction involves converting homogeneous d-cocycles ν_d into diagonal d-body unitary gates $U(\nu_d)$, which are applied transversally across a $(d-1)$-dimensional lattice containing n qudits. This prescription outputs a state $|\psi(\nu_d)\rangle$, said to be the d-cocycle state generated by ν_d, which in Section II C we had written in inhomogeneous form as $|\psi(\omega_d)\rangle$.

To define our d-cocycle state, we need to choose a symmetry G, a d-cocycle $\nu_d \in \mathcal{Z}^d(G, U(1))$, and a lattice Λ. We use G to determine the Hilbert space of a single qudit, H_G, which is chosen to be the (left) regular representation of G. This means that H_G has dimension $|G|$, is spanned by an orthonormal "G basis" $\{|a\rangle\}_{a\in G}$, and is acted on by G as $X_g|a\rangle = |ga\rangle$, for all $g, a \in G$. H_G contains a unique symmetric state $|+_G\rangle$, given by $|+_G\rangle = \sum_{a\in G}|a\rangle$ (up to normalization).

When $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \simeq \{0,1\}$, H_G corresponds to a single qubit, where the G basis is the usual computational basis and $X_0 = I, X_1 = X$. For $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$, our main case of interest, we can use the isomorphism $H_{(\mathbb{Z}_2)^m} \simeq (H_{\mathbb{Z}_2})^{\otimes m}$ to identify each local spin with a collection of m qubits. This identification depends on our choice of generating set for $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$, relative to which an arbitrary G basis vector splits as $|a\rangle \simeq \bigotimes_{i=1}^m |a_i\rangle^{(i)}$, with i indexing the m "virtual" qubits collectively representing $H_{(\mathbb{Z}_2)^m}$. However, the identity $|+_{(\mathbb{Z}_2)^m}\rangle \simeq \bigotimes_{i=1}^m |+\rangle^{(i)}$ remains true in every generating set, where $|+\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$.

Given H_G, we can use our d-cocycle ν_d to construct a d-body "formation gate" $U(\nu_d)$, which is used to generate $|\psi(\nu_d)\rangle$. This gate is diagonal in the G basis, and has the form of

$$U(\nu_d) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}\in G^d} \nu_d(e, a^{(1)}, a^{(2)}, \ldots, a^{(d)})\, |\mathbf{a}\rangle\langle\mathbf{a}|\,. \tag{A5}$$

Here, $\mathbf{a} = (a^{(1)}, \ldots, a^{(d)})$ is a tuple of d group elements $a^{(c)} \in G$ and $|\mathbf{a}\rangle = \bigotimes_{c=1}^d \left|a^{(c)}\right\rangle^{(c)}$ is the corresponding d-qudit product state, with c indexing the d qudits which $U(\nu_d)$ acts on.

To form our d-cocycle state $|\psi(\nu_d)\rangle$, we place a symmetric qudit $|+_G\rangle \in H_G$ at every vertex of our lattice Λ, then transversally apply $U(\nu_d)$ to the vertices surrounding each d-simplex in Λ. We assume that Λ is a $(d-1)$-dimensional, d-colorable simplicial complex with closed boundaries and n vertices. In this case, the d vertices surrounding each d-simplex $\Delta_d \in \Lambda_d$ are all different colors, which lets us pair the final d indices of ν_d with the d colors of our lattice in a fixed manner. The transversal application of $U(\nu_d)$ then defines a "formation circuit" U_F, which forms $|\psi(\nu_d)\rangle$ as $|\psi(\nu_d)\rangle = U_F\,|+_G\rangle^{\otimes n}$. U_F is given by

$$U_F = \prod_{\Delta_d\in\Lambda_d} U(\nu_d)^{s(\Delta_d)}, \tag{A6}$$

where $U(\nu_d)$ is applied to the d qudits surrounding each d-simplex Δ_d, and $s(\Delta_d) = \pm 1$ serves to alternately apply either $U(\nu_d)$ or its complex conjugate. $s(\Delta_d)$ is chosen so that every pair of d-simplices Δ_d, Δ_d' which overlap along a common $(d-1)$-simplex satisfy $s(\Delta_d) = -s(\Delta_d')$. This alternation turns out to guarantee that $|\psi(\nu_d)\rangle$ is invariant under the global action of G to all n vertices in Λ, provided ν_d is a valid d-cocycle. Further details on this construction can be found in [23].

It is useful to define a slight generalization of the above construction, where general d-cochains λ_d are used to form $(d-1)$-dimensional "d-cochain states" $|\psi(\lambda_d)\rangle$. This construction is essentially identical to the d-cocycle construction just described, but with λ_d taking the place of ν_d in Eq. (A5). The biggest difference between cocycle and cochain states is that the former always possess global G symmetry on closed boundaries, while the latter generally do not. In determining whether a given cochain state $|\psi(\lambda_d)\rangle$ is invariant under a symmetry operation X_g, we can always instead determine whether the formation circuit U_F commutes with X_g. This is measured by the group commutator, $K(U_F, X_g) := U_F X_g U_F^\dagger X_g^\dagger$. Clearly, $K(U_F, X_g) = I$ implies $X_g|\psi(\lambda_d)\rangle = |\psi(\lambda_d)\rangle$, but $|\psi(\lambda_d)\rangle$ being an even-magnitude superposition of all G-basis states means that $X_g|\psi(\lambda_d)\rangle = |\psi(\lambda_d)\rangle$ implies $K(U_F, X_g) = I$ as well.

Appendix B: Proof of Lemma 1

This Appendix is intended to give the complete proof of our Lemma 1, which states that every $\frac{1}{d}$-symmetric d-cocycle state is generated by a unique d-linear function τ_d, for $d \leq 3$. While the $d = 1$ case is trivial (1-cochains are the same as 1-linear functions), in Sections B 2 and B 4 we give proofs of Lemma 1 for $d = 2$ and $d = 3$, respectively. These proofs each rely upon certain technical results, which guarantee that any $(d-1)$-cochain state (see Section A 2) with global symmetry is generated by a $(d-1)$-cocycle, up to boundary terms. These results are given for $d = 2$ and $d = 3$ in Sections B 1 and B 3, respectively. While we expect that this process can be inductively continued to give a proof of Lemma 1 for arbitrary d, we focus here on developing a physically motivated proof applicable to our computationally relevant setting of 1D and 2D MQC resource states.

In the following, we refer in several places to "standard d-cocycle identities" (for $d = 2$ or 3), which we typically mean to be rearrangements/reparameterizations of one of the cocycle relations

$$\nu_2(e,a,b)\nu_2^*(e,g^{-1}a,g^{-1}b) = \nu_2(e,g,b)\nu_2^*(e,g,a) \tag{B1}$$

$$\nu_3(e,a,b,c)\nu_3^*(e,g^{-1}a,g^{-1}b,g^{-1}c) = \nu_3(e,g,b,c)\nu_3^*(e,g,a,c)\nu_3(e,g,a,b). \tag{B2}$$

We will frequently use parameterized cochains or cocycles, which will be written with the variable parameter separated from the regular function arguments by a semicolon. For example, a term of the form $\lambda_2(g;a,b)$ will indicate a g-parameterized family of homogeneous 2-cochains with inputs a and b. When U_F and X_g are unitary operators, we will use $K(U_F,X_g) := U_F X_g U_F^\dagger X_g^\dagger$ to indicate their group commutator (as in Section A 2), but we will also use this notation to indicate an appropriately reparameterized product of cochains when the first argument is replaced by a d-cochain λ_d. For example, the expression $K(\nu_1(e,a),X_g) = \nu_1(e,a)X_g\nu_1^\dagger(e,a)X_g^\dagger$ is simply $\nu_1(a)\nu_1^\dagger(g^{-1}a)$. Our indexing of physical sites in the following will generally be limited to local regions whose sites are labeled as A, B, B',..., and whose corresponding group elements are labeled as a, b, b', etc. Symmetry operators are labeled analogously, and we will use $X_g^{(A,B)}$ to indicate a symmetry operator acting on sites A and B.

1. Symmetric 1-cochain states are generated by 1-cocycles

We first prove that any 1-cochain state $|\psi(\lambda_1)\rangle$ defined on closed boundaries which is invariant under global G symmetry is equivalently a 1-cocycle state, and that its 1-cochain λ_1 is a 1-cocycle up to overall phase. This result will be used in Section B 2 to prove the $d = 2$ version of Lemma 1.

For our state to have "closed boundaries" in 0D, we can wlog choose our global Hilbert space to consist of two separated spins, as shown in Figure 3a. Our global formation circuit is then $U_F = \lambda_1(e,a)\lambda_1^\dagger(e,a')$, and the condition for global symmetry (equivalently, $\frac{1}{1}$-symmetry) is that $K((X_g^{\otimes 2})^\dagger, U_F) = I$. This means,

$$K((X_g^{\otimes 2})^\dagger, U_F) = \left(\lambda_1(e,ga)\lambda_1^*(e,a)\right)\left(\lambda_1(e,ga')\lambda_1^*(e,a')\right)^* = 1. \tag{B3}$$

It is helpful here to define $\omega_1(g;a) := \lambda_1(e,ga)\lambda_1^*(e,a)$. In this case, Eq. (B3) requires $\omega_1(g;a) = \omega_1(g;e)$, so that $\omega_1(g;a)$ is independent of a. This lets us abbreviate $\omega_1(g) := \omega_1(g;e)$, in which case $\lambda_1(e,a) = \omega_1(a)\lambda_1(e,e) = \alpha\,\omega_1(a)$, where $\alpha := \lambda_1(e,e)$ contributes only a constant overall phase.

Using the above relations, we find that

$$\omega_1(gh) = \lambda_1(e,gh)\lambda_1^*(e,e) = \left(\lambda_1(e,gh)\lambda_1^*(e,h)\right)\left(\lambda_1(e,h)\lambda_1^*(e,e)\right) = \omega_1(g;h)\,\omega_1(h;e) \tag{B4}$$

$$= \omega_1(g)\,\omega_1(h). \tag{B5}$$

This is equivalent to $\partial_1\omega_1(g,h) = \omega_1(h)\omega_1^*(gh)\omega_1(g) = 1$, which proves that ω_1 is a valid 1-cocycle. This shows that any symmetric 1-cochain state is generated by a unique 1-cocycle ω_1, and that the associated 1-cochain is proportional to that 1-cocycle as $\lambda_1(e,a) = \alpha\,\omega_1(a)$.

2. $\frac{1}{2}$-symmetric 2-cocycle states are generated by bilinear functions (Lemma 1, d = 2)

We now move to the case of 1D 2-cocycle states with $\frac{1}{2}$-symmetry, which we will show are each generated by a unique bilinear function. Furthermore, we will show that the associated 2-cocycle itself must be a bilinear function up to overall phase. Although $\frac{1}{2}$-symmetry is a global condition on our state $|\psi(\nu_2)\rangle$, it is simple to reduce this to a local condition. In particular, if our global formation circuit is U_F, then we must have the commutator of U_F with an A-site symmetry operator, $K(U_F, X_g^{(A)})$, be trivial at this A site. This commutator is given by

$$K(U_F, X_g^{(A)}) = \left(\nu_2(e,a,b)\nu_2^*(e,a,b')\right)\left(\nu_2(e,g^{-1}a,b)\nu_2^*(e,g^{-1}a,b')\right)^* \tag{B6}$$

$$= \nu_2(g^{-1}a,a,b)\nu_2^*(g^{-1}a,a,b') = \lambda_1(g;a,b)\lambda_1^*(g;a,b'), \tag{B7}$$

where $\lambda_1(g;a,b) := \nu_2(g^{-1}a,a,b)$, and the second equality comes from a standard 2-cocycle identity. It is clear that $\lambda_1(g;a,b)$ is a 1-cocycle with respect to a and b, and the above commutator being trivial on its associated A site is equivalent to $\lambda_1(g;a,b)$ generating a symmetric 0D state on closed boundaries. From Section B 1, we know that $\lambda_1(g)$ must have the form $\lambda_1(g;a,b) = \alpha(g)\,\omega_1(g;a^{-1}b)$, where each $\omega_1(g)$ is a 1-cocycle of G. Consequently, $\nu_2(e,a,b) = \alpha(a)\,\omega_1(a;a^{-1}b)$.



FIG. 3. Reduction of global symmetry conditions for d-cochain states on closed boundaries $|\psi(\lambda_d)\rangle$ to local algebraic conditions for d-cochains λ_d, where $d = 1, 2$. (a) 1-cochain states on closed boundaries in 0D are simply pairs of unentangled spins. For $|\psi(\lambda_1)\rangle$ to possess global symmetry, the commutator of the formation circuit U_F with X_g applied to one spin must be constant at that spin, and consequently must be a complex phase. (b) For a 1D 2-cochain state $|\psi(\lambda_1)\rangle$ to possess global symmetry, the commutator of the formation circuit U_F with X_g applied to a region of our system must be constant within the interior of that region (central A site, light purple), but is generally nontrivial near the region's boundaries (dark purple).

We now wish to use the 2-cocycle nature of ν_2 to constrain the manner in which the phases $\alpha(a)$ and 1-cocycles $\omega_1(a; a^{-1}b)$ vary with a. If we take the commutator of a single $\nu_2(e, a, b)$ with the global symmetry operator $X_g^{\otimes n}$, then we find

$$K(\nu_2(e,a,b), X_g^{\otimes n}) = \nu_2(e,a,b)\nu_2^*(e,g^{-1}a,g^{-1}b) = \alpha(a)\alpha^*(g^{-1}a)\omega_1(a;a^{-1}b)\omega_1^*(g^{-1}a;a^{-1}b) \tag{B8}$$

$$= \nu_2^*(e,g,a)\nu_2(e,g,b) = \omega_1(g;a^{-1}b). \tag{B9}$$

In Eq. (B8), we directly substitute $\alpha(a)\,\omega_1(a; a^{-1}b)$ for each factor of $\nu_2(e, a, b)$, whereas in Eq. (B9) we first use a standard 2-cocycle identity, then substitute for each ν_2 term. In order for these expressions to be equivalent, we must have the following equality hold for all $g, h, f \in G$:

$$\omega_1^*(gh; f)\omega_1(g; f)\omega_1(h; f) = \alpha(gh)\alpha^*(h). \tag{B10}$$

Eq. (B10) allows us to determine how $\alpha(g)$ and $\omega_1(g; f)$ depend on their first arguments. In particular, setting $g = e$ in Eq. (B10) shows that $\omega_1(e; f) = 1$ for all f, while setting $h = e$ shows that $\alpha(g) = \alpha(e)$ for all g. Consequently, Eq. (B10) reduces to $\omega_1(gh; f) = \omega_1(g; f)\omega_1(h; f)$, so that $\omega_1(g; f)$ acts as a unitary character of G in its first argument. As $\omega_1(g; f)$ was already chosen to be a unitary character of G in its second argument, this shows that $\tau_2(g, f) := \omega_1(g; f)$ is a bilinear function of G. Since $\nu_2(e, a, b) = \alpha(a)\omega_1(a; a^{-1}b) = \alpha\,\tau_2(a, a^{-1}b)$ (with $\alpha := \alpha(e)$), this completes our proof that every $\frac{1}{2}$-symmetric 2-cocycle state is generated by a unique bilinear function τ_2, and that the inhomogeneous form of the associated 2-cocycle ν_2 is proportional to τ_2.

3. Symmetric 2-cochain states are generated by 2-cocycles

As a 1D generalization of our proof in Section B 1, we will find a necessary and sufficient algebraic condition which a 2-cochain must satisfy to define a symmetric 2-cochain state on closed boundaries. We will show that any such 2-cochain state is generated by a unique 2-cocycle ν_2, and that its associated 2-cochain can be factorized as $\lambda_2(e, a, b) = \nu_2(e, a, b)\lambda_1^{(A)*}(e, a)\lambda_1^{(B)}(e, b)$. Here, $\lambda_1^{(A)}$ and $\lambda_1^{(B)}$ are homogeneous 1-cochains which end up only acting on the boundaries of our system. Consequently, the state generated by λ_2 on closed boundaries is exactly the same as that generated by ν_2, so that we can always associated a unique 2-cocycle to every globally symmetric 2-cochain state. This result will be used in Section B 4 to prove the $d = 3$ version of Lemma 1.

The condition of being symmetric on closed boundaries in 1D is that the commutator $K(X_{g^{-1}}^{\otimes n}, U_F)$ of our formation circuit with arbitrary global symmetry operators is globally trivial. At a local level, this commutator can be expressed as a product of two-body "defect gates" associated with the commutator $\eta_2(g; e, a, b) := K(X_g^{(A,B)\dagger}, \lambda_2(e, a, b))$, and global symmetry requires the product of these defect gates to be trivial in the interior of any region it is being transversally applied to (see Figure 3b). This implies that the A-interior product $\eta_2(g; e, a, b)\eta_2^*(g; e, a, b')$ should be independent of a, and that the B-interior product $\eta_2(g; e, a, b)\eta_2^*(g; e, a', b)$ should be independent of b. As we show below, these two algebraic conditions alone are sufficient to show that the state generated by λ_2 is a 2-cocycle state.

Before going further, we first derive an important consistency relation involving η_2. Since $\eta_2(g; e, a, b) =$

$\lambda_2(e,ga,gb)\lambda_2^*(e,a,b)$, we have that

$$\eta_2(gh;e,a,b) = \lambda_2(e,gha,ghb)\lambda_2^*(e,a,b) \tag{B11}$$
$$= (\lambda_2(e,gha,ghb)\lambda_2^*(e,ha,hb))\,(\lambda_2(e,ha,hb)\lambda_2^*(e,a,b)) \tag{B12}$$
$$= \eta_2(g;e,ha,hb)\eta_2(h;e,a,b). \tag{B13}$$

We will make use of Eq. (B13) shortly, but for now focus on expanding the algebraic conditions mentioned above which arise from global symmetry. These conditions require that certain overlapping products of $\eta_2(g;e,a,b)$ terms must be independent of the value taken within their region of overlap. This can be expressed as the vanishing of double commutators

$$K(X_h^{(A)\dagger}, \eta_2(g;e,a,b)\eta_2^*(g;e,a,b')) = (\eta_2(g;e,ha,b)\eta_2^*(g;e,a,b))\,(\eta_2(g;e,ha,b')\eta_2^*(g;e,a,b'))^* = 1 \tag{B14}$$
$$K(X_h^{(B)\dagger}, \eta_2(g;e,a,b)\eta_2^*(g;e,a',b)) = (\eta_2(g;e,a,hb)\eta_2^*(g;e,a,b))\,(\eta_2(g;e,a',hb)\eta_2^*(g;e,a',b))^* = 1 \tag{B15}$$

In order for Eqn.'s B14 and B14 to hold, we must have $\eta_2(g;e,ha,b)\eta_2^*(g;e,a,b)$ be independent of b, and $\eta_2(g;e,a,hb)\eta_2^*(g;e,a,b)$ be independent of a, which lets us define $\omega_2^{(A)}(g,h;e,a) := \eta_2(g;e,ha,e)\eta_2^*(g;e,a,e)$ and $\omega_2^{(B)}(g,h;e,b) := \eta_2(g;e,e,hb)\eta_2^*(g;e,b)$. This allows us to express $\eta_2(g;e,a,b)$ as

$$\eta_2(g;e,a,b) = \omega_2^{(A)}(g,a;e,e)\eta_2(g;e,e,b) = \alpha(g)\,\omega_2^{(A)}(g,a)\omega_2^{(B)}(g,b), \tag{B16}$$

where $\alpha(g) := \eta_2(g;e,e,e)$, and we have chosen to abbreviate $\omega_2^{(A)}(g,a) := \omega_2^{(A)}(g,a;e,e)$ and $\omega_2^{(B)}(g,b) := \omega_2^{(B)}(g,b;e,e)$. We can now insert this expression for η_2 into Eq. (B13), which gives the following consistency relation between α, $\omega_2^{(A)}$, and $\omega_2^{(B)}$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_1\alpha(g,h) &= \alpha(g)\alpha^*(gh)\alpha(h)\\ &= \left(\omega_2^{(A)}(g,ha)\omega_2^{(A)*}(gh,a)\omega_2^{(A)}(h,a)\right)^*\left(\omega_2^{(B)}(g,hb)\omega_2^{(B)*}(gh,b)\omega_2^{(B)}(h,b)\right)^*\\ &= \omega_2^{(A)*}(g,h)\omega_2^{(B)}(g,h),\end{aligned} \tag{B17}$$

where the last equality in Eq. (B17) comes from setting $a=b=e$ and using the fact that $\omega_2^{(A)}(h,e) = \omega_2^{(B)}(h,e) = 1$. This is allowed, since the second equality in Eq. (B17) reveals this quantity to be independent of a and b. Consequently, we have that $\omega_2^{(A)}(g,a) = \left(\omega_2^{(B)}(g,a)\,\partial_1\alpha(g,a)\right)^*$, which can be used to revise our expression for $\eta_2(g;e,a,b) = \alpha(ga)\alpha^*(a)\omega_2^{(B)*}(g,a)\omega_2^{(B)}(g,b)$. We insert this back into Eq. (B13) to obtain

$$\left(\omega_2^{(B)}(g,ha)\omega_2^{(B)*}(gh,a)\omega_2^{(B)}(h,a)\right)\left(\omega_2^{(B)}(g,hb)\omega_2^{(B)*}(gh,b)\omega_2^{(B)}(h,b)\right)^* = 1. \tag{B18}$$

Because of the factorization of Eq. (B18) into terms which depend only on a or only on b, each term must be equal to some function of g and h alone, which we will call $\phi(g,h) := \omega_2^{(B)}(g,hb)\omega_2^{(B)*}(gh,b)\omega_2^{(B)}(h,b)$. Setting $b=e$ in this expression for $\phi(g,h)$ reveals that $\phi(g,h) = \omega_2^{(B)}(g,h)$, which is a key result. We can insert this into our definition of $\phi(g,h)$ to show that $\omega_2^{(B)}$ is a valid inhomogeneous 2-cocycle, via

$$\partial_2\omega_2^{(B)}(g,h,b) = \omega_2^{(B)}(h,b)\,\omega_2^{(B)*}(gh,b)\,\omega_2^{(B)}(g,hb)\,\omega_2^{(B)^*}(g,h) = 1. \tag{B19}$$

With this 2-cocycle in hand, we can quickly express our original 2-cochain λ_2 as a homogeneous 2-cocycle with additional boundary terms. In particular, from our original definition of $\eta_2(g;e,a,b)$, we see that $\lambda_2(e,a,b) = \eta_2(a;e,e,a^{-1}b)\,\lambda_1(a,b)$, where $\lambda_1(a,b) := \lambda_2(e,e,a^{-1}b)$ is a homogeneous 1-cochain. We can use this to obtain

$$\lambda_2(e,a,b) = \alpha^*(e)\omega_2^{(B)*}(a,e)\,\alpha(a)\lambda_1(a,b)\,\omega_2^{(B)}(a,a^{-1}b) \tag{B20}$$
$$= \left(\partial_1\lambda_1(e,a,b)\,\omega_2^{(B)}(a,a^{-1}b)\right)(\alpha(a)\lambda_1^*(e,a))\,\lambda_1(e,b) \tag{B21}$$
$$= \nu_2(e,a,b)\lambda_1^{(A)*}(e,a)\lambda_1^{(B)}(e,b). \tag{B22}$$

In the second equality above, we have chosen to rewrite $\lambda_1(a,b)$ in terms of the homogeneous 2-coboundary $\partial_1\lambda_1(e,a,b)$, whereas in the third equality, we have defined $\lambda_1^{(A)}(e,a) := \alpha^*(a)\lambda_1(e,a)$, $\lambda_1^{(B)}(e,b) := \lambda_1(e,b)$, and $\nu_2(e,a,b) := \partial_1\lambda_1(e,a,b)\,\omega_2^{(B)}(a,a^{-1}b)$. From its definition, it is clear that $\nu_2(e,a,b)$ is a valid homogeneous 2-cocycle, and this consequently completes our proof that any symmetric 2-cochain state is generated by a unique 2-cocycle.

4. $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric 3-cocycle states are generated by trilinear functions (Lemma 1, d = 3)

We now consider 2D 3-cocycle states with $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetry, which we will show are each generated by a unique trilinear function. Furthermore, we will show that the associated 3-cocycle must itself be a trilinear function, up to terms which only act on the boundaries of our system. We take a similar approach as was done in Section B 2, where we reduce the global $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetry condition on the state $|\psi(\nu_3)\rangle$ to a local algebraic condition on the 3-cocycle ν_3. If our global formation circuit is U_F, then we must have the commutator of U_F with an A-site symmetry operator, $K(U_F, X_g^{(A)})$, be trivial at this A site. This commutator, which is only supported on the B and C sites surrounding our A site, is given by

$$K(U_F, X_g^{(A)}) = \prod_{<i,j>} \left(\nu_3(e, a, b_i, c_j)\nu_3^*(e, g^{-1}a, b_i, c_j)\right) \tag{B23}$$

$$= \prod_{<i,j>} \nu_3(g^{-1}a, a, b_i, c_j) = \prod_{<i,j>} \lambda_2(g; a, b_i, c_j), \tag{B24}$$

where $\lambda_2(g; a, b_i, c_j) := \nu_3(g^{-1}a, a, b_i, c_j)$, and the second equality comes from using a standard 3-cocycle identity. It is clear that $\lambda_2(g; a, b, c)$ is a 2-cocycle with respect to a, b, and c, and the above commutator being trivial on its associated A site is equivalent to $\lambda_2(g; a, b, c)$ generating a symmetric 1D state on closed boundaries. From Section B 3, we know that each $\lambda_2(g)$ must have the form $\lambda_2(g; a, b, c) = \nu_2(g; a, b, c)\lambda_1^{(B)*}(g; a, b)\lambda_1^{(C)}(g; a, c)$, where each $\nu_2(g)$ is a 2-cocycle, and all $\lambda_1^{(B)}(g)$'s, $\lambda_1^{(C)}(g)$'s are 1-cochains. While this condition on $\lambda_2(g)$ comes only from assuming fractional symmetry with respect to A-site symmetries, full $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetry requires more, namely that each $\lambda_2(g)$ generates a $\frac{1}{2}$-symmetric 1D state. From Section B 2, we know that this forces each $\nu_2(g)$ to be associated with a unique bilinear function $\tau_2(g)$. Consequently, we can make use of the ansatz $\nu_3(e, a, b, c) = \lambda_2(a; a, b, c) = \tau_2(a; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c)\lambda_1^*(a; a, b)\lambda_1(a; a, c)\beta_1(a; a, b)$, where $\lambda_1(g; a, c) := \lambda_1^{(C)}(g; a, c)$ and $\beta_1(g; a, b) := \lambda_1^{(B)*}(g; a, b)\lambda_1^{(C)}(g; a, b)$.

With this ansatz for ν_3 in hand, we can now use the 3-cocycle nature of ν_3 to constrain the manner in which the 1-cochains $\lambda_1(g; a, c)$ and $\beta_1(g; a, b)$, as well as the bilinear 2-cocycles $\tau_2(g; a, b, c)$, vary with g. If we take the commutator of $\nu_3(e, a, b, c)$ with the global symmetry operator $X_g^{\otimes n}$, we obtain

$$K(\nu_3(e, a, b, c), X_g^{\otimes n}) = \nu_3(e, a, b, c)\nu_3^*(e, g^{-1}a, g^{-1}b, g^{-1}c) \tag{B25}$$

$$= \tau_2(a; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c)\tau_2^*(g^{-1}a; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c) \times \left(\frac{\lambda_1^*(a; a, b)\lambda_1(a; a, c)\beta_1(a; a, b)}{\lambda_1^*(g^{-1}a; a, b)\lambda_1(g^{-1}a; a, c)\beta_1(g^{-1}a; a, b)}\right) \tag{B26}$$

$$= \nu_3(e, g, a, b)\nu_3^*(e, g, a, c)\nu_3(e, g, b, c) = \tau_2(g; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c)\beta_1(g; g, b). \tag{B27}$$

In Eq. (B26), we directly substitute our ansatz for each factor of ν_3, whereas in Eq. (B27) we first use a standard 3-cocycle identity, then substitute for each ν_3 factor. In order for these expressions to be equal, we must have the following hold for all $g, h, f \in G$:

$$\tau_2^*(a; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c)\tau_2(g; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c)\tau_2(g^{-1}a; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c) = \frac{\lambda_1^*(a; a, b)\lambda_1(a; a, c)\beta_1(a; a, b)\beta_1^*(g; g, b)}{\lambda_1^*(g^{-1}a; a, b)\lambda_1(g^{-1}a; a, c)\beta_1(g^{-1}a; a, b)}. \tag{B28}$$

Eq. (B28) can be used to generate general constraints on the $\lambda_1(g; a, c)$, $\beta_1(g; a, b)$, and $\tau_2(g; a, b, c)$ by considering particular values of g, a, b, and c. To begin with, setting $g = e$ gives the constraint $\tau_2(e; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c) = \beta_1^*(e; e, b)$, which holds for all values of a, b, and c. Choosing $a = b = c$ shows that $\beta_1(e; e, a) = \tau_2(e; e, e) = 1$, where the last equality comes from the fact that $\tau_2(g; h, f) = 1$ whenever $h = e$ or $f = e$. Consequently, this shows that $\beta_1(e; a, b) = \tau_2(e; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c) = 1$.

We can now set $b = c$ to obtain $\beta_1(a; a, b)\beta_1^*(g^{-1}a; a, b)\beta_1^*(g; g, b) = 1$, which shows that the factors of β_1 appearing in Eq. (B28) are collectively trivial. This lets us update Eq. (B28) to read

$$\tau_2^*(a; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c)\tau_2(g; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c)\tau_2(g^{-1}a; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c) = \frac{\lambda_1^*(a; a, b)\lambda_1(a; a, c)}{\lambda_1^*(g^{-1}a; a, b)\lambda_1(g^{-1}a; a, c)}. \tag{B29}$$

We can now set $a = b$ in the above expression to obtain $\lambda_1(a; a, c)\lambda_1^*(g^{-1}a; a, c) = \delta(a)\delta_1^*(g^{-1}a)$, where we have defined $\delta_1(a) := \lambda_1(a; e, e)$. This substitution allows us to replace the entire right hand side of Eq. (B29), obtaining

$$\tau_2^*(a; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c)\tau_2(g; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c)\tau_2(g^{-1}a; a^{-1}b, b^{-1}c) = 1. \tag{B30}$$

Eq. (B30) clearly shows that the three-index function $\tau_3(g,h,f) := \tau_2(g;h,f)$ is a unitary character of G with respect to its first argument, while the bilinear nature of each $\tau_2(g)$ guarantees that τ_3 is a character in its other arguments as well. Consequently, this proves that τ_3 is a trilinear function of G, and that our original 3-cocycle is related to τ_3 as $\nu_3(e,a,b,c) = \tau_3(a,a^{-1}b,b^{-1}c)\lambda_1^{(B)*}(a;a,b)\lambda_1^{(C)}(a;a,c)$. Since these last two parameterized 1-cochains act as 2-body terms between A and B (or A and C) sites, they multiply away on closed boundaries, with the resulting state identical to that generated by τ_3, i.e. $|\psi(\nu_3)\rangle = |\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$. This completes our proof of Lemma 1 for $d = 3$.

Appendix C: Proofs of Theorem 1 (d = 3), Corollary 1, and Theorem 2

In this Appendix, we will describe the proofs of Theorem 1 (for $d = 3$), Corollary 1, and Theorem 2, all of which involve a study of the 3-index component tensors $\hat{\tau}_3$ associated with general $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric 3-cocycle states. Theorem 1 is proved as a straightforward consequence of our choice of disjoint normal form for trilinear functions. Corollary 1 is proved by finding a simple change of basis which transforms $\hat{\tau}_3$ into an "edge disjoint" normal form, which is compatible with the normal form of Theorem 1. Theorem 2 is proved using simple operational arguments, and some known results about the structure of 2D SPTO phases relative to abelian G.

Before we begin these proofs, let's briefly review the role of the 3-index binary tensor $\hat{\tau}_3$ in structuring our 3-cocycle state $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$. As we know from Lemma 1, any $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric 3-cocycle state $|\psi(\omega_3)\rangle$ on closed boundaries is generated by a unique trilinear function τ_3, so that $|\psi(\omega_3)\rangle = |\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$. When $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$, this lets us drastically simplify our description of $|\psi(\omega_3)\rangle$, from the $\mathcal{O}(|G|^2) = \mathcal{O}(4^m)$ complex parameters needed to describe ω_3 to the m^3 binary components describing τ_3. By fixing a generating set, we can naturally arrange these components in an $m \times m \times m$ binary tensor $\hat{\tau}_3$, whose algebraic properties encode details of the many-body entanglement structure of $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$. For example, we showed in Section III that for $d = 2$, the rank r of the component matrix $\hat{\tau}_2$ is equal to the (logarithm of the) Schmidt rank of our state $|\psi(\tau_2)\rangle$ across any bipartition, owing to $|\psi(\tau_2)\rangle \simeq |\psi_{1C}\rangle^{\otimes r}$.

When a fixed generating set is used, each tensor $\hat{\tau}_3$ uniquely describes the many-body state $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$; however, the lack of a canonical choice of generating set means that two states with non-identical tensors $\hat{\tau}_3$ and $\hat{\tau}_3'$ might nonetheless be related by a local change of basis. To remedy this issue, we can analyze the "local unitary orbits" of $\hat{\tau}_3$ under index-dependent changes of basis, which act on each of $\hat{\tau}_3$'s indices as invertible matrices over $GF(2)$, χ_A, χ_B, and χ_C. Using a decomposition of χ_A, χ_B, χ_C into elementary matrices (those which implement elementary row and column operations), it is easy to show that these changes of basis manifest physically as a product of Clifford $CNOT$ gates on the m virtual qubits at each site, and consequently have no influence on the Pauli universality of our $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$.

1. Theorem 1 (d = 3)

Our proof of Theorem 1 for $d = 3$ involves a basic use of the normal form we have chosen for our 3-index tensor $\hat{\tau}_3$. We first define the support of $\hat{\tau}_3$ at a specific index, say C, which is a certain subgroup $S_C \subseteq (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ associated to τ_3. Our definition of the support is slightly unusual, as the collection of C-site unitary characters $\omega_1^{(a_0,b_0)}(c)$ obtained by fixing arbitrary A- and B-site arguments. Mathematically, $S_C \simeq \{\omega_1^{(a_0,b_0)}(c) := \tau_3(a_0,b_0,c) \,|\, (a_0,b_0) \in G^2\}$. An obvious generalization of this definition is used for the A- and B-site supports S_A and S_B of $\hat{\tau}_3$.

We choose our disjoint normal form to capture the maximal possible decomposition of $\hat{\tau}_3$ into tensors $\hat{\tau}_3^{(i)}$ with completely disjoint supports. Mathematically, this means that if $\hat{\tau}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{\tau}_3^{(i)}$, and if $S_A^{(i)}$, $S_B^{(i)}$, and $S_C^{(i)}$ indicate the index-specific supports of $\hat{\tau}_3^{(i)}$, then $S_A^{(i)} \cap S_A^{(j)} = S_B^{(i)} \cap S_B^{(j)} = S_C^{(i)} \cap S_C^{(j)} = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$. If $\hat{\tau}_3$ is nontrivial and there is no nontrivial decomposition of $\hat{\tau}_3$ into multiple disjoint tensors, then we say that $\hat{\tau}_3$ is irreducible. When $\hat{\tau}_3$ is the sum of r disjoint irreducible tensors, $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ is clearly the tensor product of r irreducible 3-cocycle states. Consequently, proving that this normal form exists and is well-defined proves the physical decomposition stated in Theorem 1.

The existence of our disjoint normal form for all tensors $\hat{\tau}_3$ can be proved through a simple argument. $\hat{\tau}_3$ can be graphically represented as in Figure 2, as a collection of triangles arranged between $3m$ vertices. If these triangles can be grouped into two sets with no mutual intersections (triangles from one set don't intersect those from the other), then we immediately obtain a decomposition of $\hat{\tau}_3$ into two disjoint tensors. Conversely, when $\hat{\tau}_3$ is irreducible, an exhaustive search of all possible index-dependent changes of basis will find $\hat{\tau}_3$ to never have a representation as two sets of disjoint triangles. Performing this search will therefore end in either a decomposition of $\hat{\tau}_3$ into two disjoint tensors, or a proof that $\hat{\tau}_3$ is irreducible. Continuing this inductively will eventually obtain our desired disjoint normal form, which completes our proof of Theorem 1 for $d = 3$.

Because of its use of exhaustive search, the runtime of our tensor normal form algorithm is clearly exponential in m. This should be contrasted to the proof of Theorem 1 when $d = 2$, where the normal form of $\hat{\tau}_2$ was obtained

efficiently using Gaussian elimination. While a similarly efficient algorithm is obviously desirable here, we emphasize that our above algorithm is still sufficient to prove that $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ is isomorphic to a product of r mutually unentangled irreducible 3-cocycle states, with a unique r. Furthermore, we will see in Section C 2 that any nontrivial $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ can still be efficiently utilized as a Pauli-universal resource state, without any knowledge of its decomposition into irreducible states. Consequently, the existence or nonexistence of an efficient algorithm to compute this normal form has no impact on our ability to utilize $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle states as Pauli-universal resource states.

2. Corollary 1

Here we give a proof of Corollary 1, which says that any nontrivial $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric 3-cocycle state with $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ can be reduced to r disjoint copies of the Union Jack state via single-site measurements, showing that every such state is a Pauli universal resource state for MQC. We note that these single-site measurements are single-qudit, but not generally single-qubit relative to the m virtual qubits at each site. However, if our aim is only to prepare a single copy of the Union Jack state, these measurements can always be chosen to be single-qubit.

Our proof is a simple index-dependent change of basis for the tensor $\hat{\tau}_3$, which we choose to eliminate any "edge incidences" between some arbitrary fiducial component $\hat{\tau}_3(i_0, j_0, k_0)$ and all other components. More concretely, if $\hat{\tau}_3(i, j, k) = \hat{\tau}_3(i_0, j_0, k_0) = 1$ are two distinct nonzero components of $\hat{\tau}_3$, we say these components are edge incident when two of the equalities $i = i_0$, $j = j_0$, or $k = k_0$ hold, vertex incident when only one equality holds, and disjoint when none hold. By eliminating the edge incident terms, we ensure that the measurement of all other virtual qubits in the Z basis will leave a single copy of the Union Jack state on (color-specific) sites i_0, j_0, and k_0, up to Z byproduct operators at the intersecting vertices. These byproduct operators can be accounted for with purely classical postprocessing, whereas edge-incident terms would have led to CZ byproduct operators, which are nontrivial to correct for. Exhibiting such a change of basis consequently proves that our nontrivial $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle state can be reduced to one copy of the Union Jack state, while applying this procedure to each of the disjoint irreducible states in Theorem 1 proves Corollary 1.

We determine our change of basis iteratively, by examining each nonzero component which is edge incident with our fiducial component $\hat{\tau}_3(i_0, j_0, k_0) = 1$. If such a component, say $\hat{\tau}_3(i_0, j_0, k_1) = 1$ (with $k_0 \neq k_1$), is incident along the AB edge, we can eliminate this component by applying a shear operation χ_C to the C index of $\hat{\tau}_3$. χ_C has nonzero matrix elements of $\chi_C(k, k) = 1$ for all k with $1 \geq k \geq m$, and $\chi_C(k_0, k_1) = 1$. These act on the components of $\hat{\tau}_3$ as $\chi_C : \hat{\tau}_3(i, j, k) \mapsto \hat{\tau}_3(i, j, k)$ when $k \neq k_1$, and $\chi_C : \hat{\tau}_3(i, j, k_1) \mapsto \hat{\tau}_3(i, j, k_1) \oplus \hat{\tau}_3(i, j, k_0)$ when $k = k_1$, where $\oplus$ indicates addition mod 2. It is clear that this C-site change of basis will eliminate the offending component $\hat{\tau}_3(i_0, j_0, k_1)$, while also avoiding the introduction of any new edge incident terms. We can utilize a similar technique to eliminate all components which are edge incident along AC or BC edges, showing that a series of such changes of basis will leave $\hat{\tau}_3$ in our desired form, with $\hat{\tau}_3(i_0, j_0, k_0)$ at most vertex incident with all other components. This completes our proof of Corollary 1.

3. Theorem 2

Here we give a proof of Theorem 2, which states that every pair of non-identical $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric 3-cocycle states with $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$ belong to different SPTO phases relative to $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$. This in turn implies that every nontrivial $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle state has nontrivial SPTO relative to $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$. Our proof requires first describing the classification of 2D SPTO phases relative to a global symmetry $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$. We then use an embedding argument to show that every component of the 3-index tensor $\hat{\tau}_3$ itself constitutes a unique binary label of $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$'s SPTO phase relative to global G^3 symmetry. While this doesn't necessarily give the state's SPTO phase relative to fractional symmetry $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$, an operational argument lets us show that these two classifications coincide for the case of $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle states. Consequently, the only way for two $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric states to have the same $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$ SPTO phase is to have the same component tensors, and consequently to be identical states. This suffices to prove Theorem 2.

We can use known results from [54] (see also [55]) to determine the structure of the cohomology group $\mathcal{H}^3((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m, U(1))$, whose elements classify the 2D SPTO phases relative to $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$. For simplicity, we will write $\mathcal{H}^3((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m)$ for $\mathcal{H}^3((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m, U(1))$. Using a Künneth formula, $\mathcal{H}^3((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m)$ can be shown to be the direct product of groups $\mathcal{H}^3_I((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m)$, $\mathcal{H}^3_{II}((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m)$, $\mathcal{H}^3_{III}((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m)$, which are respectively called type-I, type-II, and type-III factors. Each of these factors is isomorphic to a product of multiple copies of $\mathbb{Z}_2$, as $\mathcal{H}^3_I((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m) \simeq (\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$, $\mathcal{H}^3_{II}((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m) \simeq (\mathbb{Z}_2)^{\binom{m}{2}}$, and $\mathcal{H}^3_{III}((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m) \simeq (\mathbb{Z}_2)^{\binom{m}{3}}$, where each $\binom{m}{l}$ indicates a binomial coefficient. By fixing a generating set for $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^m$, the individual $\mathbb{Z}_2$ components of each of these factors can be labeled by individual generators for $\mathcal{H}^3_I((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m)$, by pairs



FIG. 4. An illustration of our embedding technique, where our $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle state with global symmetry $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^2$ state is mapped to a 3-cocycle state with global symmetry $G^3 = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^6$. Each lattice color is sent to a different copy of G in G^3, so that the global application of each generator of G^3 acts nontrivially only at a single color of our embedded state. For example, the application of X to all qubits on the fifth layer of our embedded system is equivalent to the color-dependent application of X to the C_1 qubits of our original system. This embedding technique can be extended to achieve an embedding of constant-depth quantum circuits, which lets us show that two states in the same SPTO phase relative to fractional $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$ symmetry must be in the same SPTO phase relative to the global G^3 symmetry of the embedded system. The reverse implication may fail in a sufficiently general setting, owing to the lack of any obvious method for taking constant-depth quantum circuits defined on the embedded system and "unembedding" them into circuits acting in the original setting of $|G|$-dimensional qudits.

of distinct generators for $\mathcal{H}^3_{II}((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m)$, and by triples of distinct generators for $\mathcal{H}^3_{III}((\mathbb{Z}_2)^m)$. Additionally, [54] shows how one can construct model 3-cocycles for each cohomology class, which all happen to be trilinear functions.

We now show how this classification ends up giving the SPTO phases of our $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric cocycle states relative to $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$. While the $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$ symmetry of $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ isn't itself a global symmetry, we can make it into one by embedding each spin of $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$, with local Hilbert space H_G, into a larger Hilbert space H_{G^3}. H_{G^3} is isomorphic to three copies of H_G, and we choose to embed A-site spins in the first copy of H_G, B-site spins in the second copy, and C-site spins in the third (see Figure 4). The virtual qubits at each site associated with the two unused copies of H_G are initialized in the $|+\rangle$ state, which ensures that the $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$ symmetry of our original state can be faithfully reproduced using the G^3 symmetry present in our embedded state. Recall now that SPTO phases relative to $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$ are defined operationally as equivalence classes of many-body states under the application of constant-depth, $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$-respecting local quantum circuits. By embedding these circuits into our G^3 setting, it is clear that any $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$-respecting quantum circuit which connects two $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$-invariant states will yield a G^3-respecting quantum circuit connecting the associated embedded G^3-invariant states. This gives us the operational result that two $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric states in the same SPTO phase relative to $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$ must be in the same SPTO phase relative to G^3.

Since every embedded state is itself a 3-cocycle state of G^3, we can use the above classification to determine the SPTO phase of any $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ with respect to global G^3. In particular, each nontrivial component $\hat{\tau}_3(i,j,k) = 1$ corresponds in the embedded setting to a model 3-cocycle of type-III SPTO, associated with the triple of distinct generators $(i, j+m, k+2m)$. This labeling arises from the site-dependent embedding of our original system into the larger Hilbert space H_{G^3}, where a generator at layer i on sites A, B, or C will be sent to a generator at layer i, layer $i+m$, or layer $i+2m$, respectively. Because each triple is an independent label for the SPTO phase of $|\psi(\tau_3)\rangle$ relative to G^3, this shows that any two $\frac{1}{3}$-symmetric states with non-identical tensors $\hat{\tau}_3, \hat{\tau}'_3$ belong to different SPTO phases relative to G^3. The contrapositive of our operational result described above then shows that our non-identical states belong to different SPTO phases relative to $G_{\frac{1}{3}}$, which completes our proof of Theorem 2.